



**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

IN RE APPLICATION OF: Peijun Ding et al.

SERIAL NO.: 08/995,108

FILED: December 19, 1997

FOR: A TAILORED BARRIER LAYER WHICH  
PROVIDES IMPROVED COPPER INTERCONNECT  
ELECTROMIGRATION RESISTANCE

§ GROUP ART UNIT: 1753

§  
§ EXAMINER: J. Mercado

§  
§ Attorney Docket No.:  
§ AM-1776

Date: February 1, 2000

#  
5 A/W.M.  
2/15/00

**AMENDMENT "A"**  
**UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111**

**Hon. Assistant Commissioner of Patents**  
**Washington, D.C. 20231**

Sir:

This Amendment "A" is in response to the Office Action mailed September 2, 1999, having a shortened statutory period for response of December 2, 1999. A Petition for a two month extension of time to reply accompanies this Amendment "A", to extend the time to respond through February 2, 1000.

Claims 1 - 27 are pending in the application.

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR 1.10**

I hereby certify that this paper and any documents said to accompany this paper are being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as U.S. EXPRESS MAIL NO. EL372083921US in an envelope addressed to the: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Box Non-Fee Amendment, Washington DC 20231.

Date: February 1, 2000

*Shirley L. Church*  
Shirley L. Church, Reg. No.31,858

02/16/2000 WHITCHELL 00000001 110600 08995108

01 FC:102 78.00 LN

RECEIVED  
FEB - 2000  
TC 21700 MAIL ROOM

Claims 1 - 27 are subject to restriction requirement.

Claims 21 - 27 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claims 22 and 24 - 26 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claims 21 - 27 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 22 and 24 - 26 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claims 8 - 11, 14, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,281,485, to Colgan et al.

Claims 8 - 17 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,391,517, to Gelatos et al., in combination with U.S. Patent No. 5,676,587, to Landers et al.

Claims 8 - 17 and 21 - 26 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,985,750, to Hoshino, in view of Landers et al.

Claims 8 - 17 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,240,880, to Hindman et al., in view of either Landers et al. or Hoshino.

Claims 12, 13, and 16 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan et al., in view of either Landers et al., Gelatos et al., or Hoshino.

Claims 18 - 20 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gelatos et al., in combination with Landers et al., as applied to Claims 8 - 17, above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,707,498, to Ngan.